Case 2:17-cv-02303-MMD-PAL Document 32 Filed 12/18/17 Page 1 of 3

1	Anthony Schoenberg (pro hac vice)	
2	California Bar No. 203714 aschoenberg@fbm.com	
3	David J. Lazerwitz (<i>pro hac vice</i>) California Bar No. 221349	
	dlazerwitz@fbm.com	
4	Emily M. Lieban (<i>pro hac vice</i>) California Bar No. 303079	
5	elieban@fbm.com	
6	FARELLA BRAUN + MARTEL LLP 235 Montgomery Street, 17 th Floor	
7	San Francisco, California 94104 Telephone: (415) 954-4400	
	Facsimile: (415) 954-4480	
8	Todd L. Bice	
9	Nevada Bar No. 4534	
10	tlb@pisanellibice.com Robert A. Ryan	
	Nevada Bar No. 12084	
11	rr@pisanellibice.com PISANELLI BICE PLLC	
12	400 South 7th Street, Suite 300 Las Vegas, Nevada 89101	
13	Telephone: (702) 214-2100	
14	Facsimile: (702) 214-2101	
15	Attorneys for Nevada Links, Inc.	
16	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
17	DISTRICT OF NEVADA, NORTHERN DIVISION	
18		,
	_	
19	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	Case No. 2:17-cv-02303-MMD-PAL
20	Plaintiff,	OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFF'S
21	VS.	REQUEST FOR JUDICIAL NOTICE
22	COUNTY OF CLARK and NEVADA	
23	LINKS, INC,	The Hon, Miranda M. Due
	Defendant.	The Holl. Milfalida W. Due
24		
25		
26		
27		
28	1	

Farella Braun + Martel LLP 235 Montgomery Street, 17th Floor San Francisco, California 94104 (415) 954-4400 Defendant Nevada Links, Inc. ("Nevada Links") hereby objects to evidence submitted by Plaintiff United States ("Plaintiff") in connection with its Opposition the Nevada Links' Motion to Dismiss (ECF 25).

Under Federal Rule of Evidence 201, a court shall take judicial notice "if a party requests it and the court is supplied with the necessary information." Fed. R. Evid. 201(c)(2). A court may take judicial notice of a fact "not reasonably subject to dispute because it: (1) is generally known within the trial court's territorial jurisdiction; or (2) can be accurately and readily determined from sources whose accuracy cannot reasonably be questioned." *Id.* at 201(b). "A court may take judicial notice of 'matters of public record' without converting a motion to dismiss into a motion for summary judgment, as long as the facts noticed are not subject to reasonable dispute." *Inti-Plex Techs., Inc. v. Crest Group, Inc.*, 499 F.3d 1048, 1052 (9th Cir. 2007). However, the court may not take judicial notice of a fact that is "subject to reasonable dispute." Fed. R. Evid. 201(b); *Lee v. City of Los Angeles*, 250 F.3d 668, 689 (9th Cir. 2001).

Plaintiff has asked this Court to take judicial notice of two items:

- Clark County Board of Commissioners Agenda Item, Amendment to Lease
 Agreement, submitted by Randall H. Walker, Dir. of Aviation (Sep. 6, 2011).
- 2. Video recording of the Joint Meeting of the Clark County Board of Commissioners, et al., (Sep. 6, 2011) (Meeting Video).

Because these items are matters of public record, this Court may properly take judicial notice of the <u>fact</u> that the hearing took place in 2011. However, it "may not take judicial notice of a fact that is 'subject to reasonable dispute.'" *Id.* at 690. Plaintiff asks this Court to conclude on the basis of the proffered video that "Nevada Links possessed actual knowledge of the County's legal obligations to the United States and that the Fourth Amendment, if carried out, would violate those obligations." Plaintiff's Opposition to Motion to Dismiss by Defendant Nevada Links, Inc. (ECF 25) at13:1-4. In doing so, Plaintiff effectively seeks judicial notice of disputed facts, which is improper. *See Lee*, 250 F.3d at 689-690 (finding that district court improperly took judicial notice that a party waived extradition in a public document). Nevada Links <u>disputes</u> that it had knowledge (actual or constructive) that by entering into the Fourth Amendment the County

Case 2:17-cv-02303-MMD-PAL Document 32 Filed 12/18/17 Page 3 of 3

1	breached any obligation to the United States. In fact, whether there even was such a breach is a	
2	fundamental disputed issue in this case. The	hus, this is an improper request for judicial notice, and
3	the Court should not consider the extrinsic evidence, other than to demonstrate the <u>fact</u> that the	
4	hearing took place in 2011.	
5		
6	Dated: December 18, 2017	FARELLA BRAUN + MARTEL LLP
7		
8		By: /s/ Anthony P. Schoenberg Anthony P. Schoenberg
9		Attorneys for Nevada Links, Inc.
10		Ittorneys for five vada Eliks, me.
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

Farella Braun + Martel LLP 235 Montgomery Street, 17th Floor San Francisco, California 94104 (415) 954-4400